DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 177 113 SP 014 543

AUTHOR Locke, Lawrence F.
TITLE Supervision, Schools, and Student Teaching: Why Things Stay the Same.
PUB DATE 15 Mar 79
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the American Academy of Physical Education (New Orleans, Louisiana, March 15, 1979)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Educational Needs; Effective Teaching; Practicum Supervision; *Program Evaluation; *Program Improvement; Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teaching; *Supervisory Methods; *Teacher Education

ABSTRACT

A review of the literature regarding the tradition of the student teaching practicum and significant criticisms of student teacher supervisors and supervisory programs are presented. Particular attention is paid to the state of the art in physical education teacher preparation. Core problems in practicum design and operation are addressed, and suggestions are made for a student teacher-oriented program. Elements of the suggested method are outlined in detail, and the purpose of teacher supervision is redefined. (LH)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED177113

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Lawrence F. Locke

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

SUPERVISION, SCHOOLS AND STUDENT TEACHING:

WHY THINGS STAY THE SAME

by

Lawrence F. Locke

Manuscript prepared for an address delivered to the American Academy of Physical Education, New Orleans, March 15, 1979

Do not cite, quote or reproduce this document or any portion thereof without the explicit permission of the author.

SP 014543

In submitting this manuscript for possible publication in the Academy Papers the author does not waive the absolute right of approval over all substantive editorial changes or excisions.

Supervision as it is practiced today suffers from the same limitations which bedeviled it 50 years ago. There have been no dramatic breakthroughs in practice. The literature of this dismal art provides scant hope for any significant change in the next decade. In the synoptic vision of Mosher and Purpel (1972) ". . . to read about supervision in 1920 is to read about supervision in 1970." (p. 14)

Many members of this Academy are veteran supervisors, and nothing said here should denigrate anyone whose personal skill and dedication have made that process work. It is equally true, however, that it does no service to say the emperor is fully clothed when he is as naked as a jay bird. Change must begin with a frank appraisal of how things really stand. That sort of honesty will require overcoming some long-standing professional inhibitions.

While we all know supervision is a difficult process, it usually is considered indelicate to dwell publicly on the gory details. Only rarely is one confronted by what really is happening. As Dyer (1977) ruefully observed:

> Mutual respect, professional loyalty and good manners seem to sugar-coat the cooperating teacher/college supervisor/student teacher interaction as though such deference will somehow make the practicum all that we want -- and need -- it to be. (p. 1)

Our profession is much in the position of a student teacher described by Iannaccone (1963) who could not produce a half-page daily diary because she thought she was not supposed to report the real feelings which pervaded her experience -- feelings like "horror" at the procedures used by her

supervisor. Reviewers have postulated that this same reticence is one root cause of the impoverished literature on learning to teach. "When you cannot say what is on your mind, it is hard to say anything at all." (Fuller & Bown, 1975) To avoid that disabling constraint, what follows is as frank and devoid of sugar-coating as it is possible to make it.

Supervision has several possible purposes. As evaluation it is an ubiquitous process designed to make sure somebody else is doing a good job. As skill development it is helping someone else learn how to do a better job. In education we apply the word as a generic term to cover (1) evaluative inspection of school teachers in order to generate information used in such decisions as hiring, firing, tenure, promotion and rewards, (2) efforts by administrators and subject matter specialists to improve the instructional effectiveness of teachers, (3) the oversight and tutelage provided by a cooperating practitioner during the apprenticeship of a student teacher, and (4) the visitations of a training program representative during that same exercise. Each of these versions of supervision involves the roles of "observer" and "observed", but the similarity ends there.

The evaluation of teachers and teacher effectiveness as an adjunct to personnel decisions in the public schools is a specie of supervision which will be treated here only briefly. It is the source of teacher anxiety, political struggles, moral dilemmas and endless debate. (Broudy, 1974; Lehman, 1974, McGuire, 1974). In the last decade, despite public clamor for teacher accountability, supervision as evaluation has been quietly downplayed in favor of models which make improvement rather than

judgment the ostensible target. The heritage which lingers on, however, equates supervision with evaluation and thus serves as the main impediment to most systematic attempts to improve instruction through the use of administrative personnel.

It is not without significance that two of the most influential books on supervision in the last decade have been titled Supervisors and Teachers: A Private Cold War (Blumberg, 1974) and Supervision: The Reluctant Profession (Mosher & Purpel, 1972). Even Goldhammer's more innocuous Clinical Supervision (1969) contains an opening chapter so scathing in its critique of educational practice as to have raised serious question about publication.

"Supervision in the schools tends to be a ritualized, sterile process that bears little relationship to the learning of youngsters." is Blumberg's assessment (1974, p. 5) and "utterly worthless" is the way many teachers characterize time spent with supervisors. (Blumberg & Amidon, 1965). The litany of teacher complaints is as well documented as it is long. Dishonesty, evasiveness, inconsistency and disrespect are among the irritating supervisor characteristics most often singled out. (Weller, 1976). Although many teachers see a need for help with their instructional problems, most see supervision as potentially dangerous, largely because the process may employ standards they don't share, and too often provides incomplete and even dishonest feedback (Heichberger & young, 1975). Supervisors are seen as out of touch, primarily interested in procedural trivia and unsure, insecure and uncomfortable in their work. While context-specific factors are important in determining the quality of relationships

(Harris, 1972), observers persistently report that many teachers treat supervisors either with indifference or open hostility (Blumberg, 1974; Goodlad, 1974).

Evaluative supervision as it occurs in the schools is of much less interest to us than supervision as it occurs in student teaching. It is in that noble triad of student teacher, program supervisor and cooperating teacher that we ourselves are represented. It is here that the other two meanings of the word supervision are given the form of action as the program's representative encounters the cooperating teacher while they both play supervisor to the novice.

At the outset let me dispel a false impression. While it is true that teachers everywhere report the practicum to have been the most important part of their training (Bennie, 1964; Hermanowicz, 1966; Mason, 1961), the pride with which teacher educators point to this fact may have been misplaced. There is a growing suspicion that what teachers really are saying is that anything would look good after four years in the typical preparation program. (Zeichner, note 12)

My own experience suggests that many teachers consider the practicum to have been a charade, a game in which they trade compliance for a grade and a recommendation. At least it is a game that is played out on the real field rather than in the college classrom, and students appreciate that distinction. The deeper problem, largely unrecognized by students or teacher educators, is that the game is restricted by rules which limit what can be accomplished. As Lortie (1975) has observed "Student teaching

may be earthy and realistic when compared with education courses, but it is also short and parochial." (p. 71)

The only discernable outcomes of student teaching are confirmation of the vocational choice as a true possibility, and initiation into the "realities" of school life. The student learns that he or she can teach (the level of mastery need be no more than minimal for this), and is socialized into the value presumptions of the school. In the latter process, the student learns that the "real" problems are time constraints, student numbers, student diversity and the consequences of compulsory attendance. In response, the student learns to accept the personna of the teacher -- aloof and authoritarian -- and assimilates the central ideology of the teaching culture which makes pupil control through management skills the hallmark of competence. (Iannoccone & Button, 1964)

Beyond this generalization about limited outcomes, what do we know about the organic details of student teaching? Lamenting over the fact that nobody seems to know the answer has become a ritual in education (Davies & Amershek, 1969; Peck & Tucker, 1973; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Turner, 1975). The most recent reviews of the literature in both education (Zeichner, note 12) and physical education (Oien, note 4) conclude that our lack of intimate knowledge about what happens to student teachers is a consequence of overreliance on research in the psychometric tradition. If we are to improve student teaching we must first come to understand it. Social-anthropological techniques, which involve first-hand observation of the triad as it functions in situ, offer one strategy through which to begin. The appropriate question at this stage of knowledge is not "Are we right?", but only "What is out there?" (Fuller & Bown, 1975, p. 52)

The fact that these same reviewers persist in concerning themselves with "improving" student teaching suggests, however, that the maligned psychometric tradition has managed to raise some serious questions. A closer look at individual studies reveals enough evidence to question the viability of student teaching in its present form on any of a dozen counts (Iannaccone, 1963; Goodlad, 1965; McDonald & Zaret, 1971; Sorenson, 1974; Salzillo & Van Fleet, 1977). Edgar Friedenberg (1973) was not the first person to recommend that we get out of the student teaching business altogether.

At the outset you can rest assured that the program supervisor plays no negative part. This is because college supervisors play no significant role at all. Studies repeatedly document that the cooperating teacher is the dominant source of influence (Evans, 1976; Friebus, 1977; Karmos & Jacko, 1977). Yee (1968) found that the interpersonal relationships within the triad seldom reach a level of involvement worthy of professional consequence, and that relations generally deteriorate as the semester proceeds. There are no identifiable effects produced by the program supervisor (Schueler, Gold & Mitzel, 1965) and it is impossible to distinguish between students who have and do not have program-based supervision on the basis of either performance or adjustment (Morris, 1974).

What do student teachers learn from cooperating teachers? As suggested above, they learn that answering the question "What works?" is the purpose of student teaching. In resolving the problems of running a class they learn to treat techniques as ends rather than as means (Iannoccone, 1963; Popkewitz, note 5; Tabachnick et al., note 9). The purposes of teaching are defined as getting through the lesson on schedule,

without disruption and without violating the canons which govern interaction with clients -- distrust of students, stress on order, punitiveness, moralism and authoritarianism (Hoy & Rees, 1977). If student teaching in the gym is much like the classroom intern experiences described by Tabachnick (note 8), the focus on routine, utilitarian skills will be in sharp contrast to the student-centered, learning-centered rhetoric of the training program.

Studies involving a wide range of psychometric pre-post measures reveal a pattern of contingencies and consequences. Student teachers with more hostile and authoritarian attitudes get higher supervisor ratings (Chabassol, 1968), as do those who are more dogmatic (Johnson, 1969). Student teachers become more rigid and less liberal. (Jacobs, 1968), less pupil centered (Walberg et al., 1968), and more other directed (Horowitz, 1968). Student teachers quickly develop strong bureaucratic values (Pruitt and Lee, 1978) and subordinate themselves to a "control ideology." (Hoy & Rees, 1977: Salazillo & Van Fleet, 1977). In sum, student teachers learn how to get along in the school -- an exercise in adapting new personnel into old patterns. How well they learn these lessons is demonstrated by the substantial correlation between supervisory evaluations derived from student teaching and those derived from the first year of teaching. (Labriola, 1965)

If you wonder whether all of this could be true in physical education, there can be no final answer because we have no adequate research. In a memorable analysis of socialization constructs, however, Burlingame (1972) suggested that physical educators should not expect to find

themselves exempt from the powerful forces which shape other teachers. A recent study by Templin (1978) confirms Burlingame's prediction. By combining research techniques from both the psychometric and ethnological traditions (itself a significant advance in research design) Templin found that student teachers promptly rejected the behaviors learned in the training program and taught physical education classes just as they might have done four years previously given only the basis of their student experience in public schools.

In an early study of teaching behaviors in student teaching, Mawson (1973) found herself puzzled by the complete absence of any change between the third week and the end of the internship. Some reflection on Templin's work (note 10) suggests that the answer rests in the fact that student teaching in the gym demands quick imitation rather than exploration and gradual evolution of a personal repertoire of teaching skills.

If student teaching, supervisors and training programs provide so little of significance in shaping the work of teachers, where does that process occur? Every evidence points to the first two years of employment. (Ryan, 1965; Lortie, 1966; Fuller, 1969; Fuller & Bown, 1975; Lortie, 1975). It is there, in the solitary process of personal trial and error, accompanied only by the ghosts of fondly remembered models, that the young physical education teacher constructs the behavioral patterns which will dominate a career. The difference between this process and the making of a practitioner in any other profession is striking. None of the intense comraderie and shared perspectives of the hospital or law office here (Lortie 1959; Becker et al., 1961). Learning to teach is a private

ordeal and as Lortie (1975) observes, it is not a process "...well suited to inculcating commonly held, empirically derived, and rigorously grounded practices and principles of pedagogy." (p. 79)

Is there no cheer in the land of supervision? Of course there is. Mackey et al. (1977) has suggested that training supervisors in the specific skills needed to work with beginning teachers should be a first priority of teacher training institutions. This strategy has been demonstrated in both education (Perrodin, 1961) and physical education (Lucas, 1974) with modest but encouraging results.

The physical education literature contains several interesting attempts to distinguish between effective and ineffective supervisory techniques through the use of critical incident research (Wright, 1965; Gibson, 1969). Several research summaries are available which tell us something of the status of supervision in the gym (Chasey, 1969), although a close reading reveals less than sanguine conclusions (Cornett, 1966). More important for the future is the fact that several observation instruments have been designed for recording and analyzing supervisory behaviors (Weller, 1969), and at least one has been used successfully in the gymnasium (Kraft, 1974).

Taken in the abstract, either as a sensitive art form or as a set of theoretical propositions, supervision has developed some sophisticated models for practice. The "traditional" paradigm for supervision, with its characteristic emphasis on teacher defects, perfunctory ritual, the expertise of the supervisor, teacher passivity, brevity, and the supervisor's personal commitments (Reavis, 1978), now has a wide range of rivals. Clinical supervision (Goldhammer, 1969; Cogan, 1972; Reavis,

1978), criterion-referenced strategies (Popham, 1969) and supervision based on counseling theory (Mosher & Purpel, 1972) have attracted national attention and generated at least local enthusiasm. Each of them provides a unique strength. Clinical supervision structures a complete reshuffling of teacher and supervisory roles and introduces analysis based on hard data. Counseling supervision presumes a commitment to deal with the teacher as a person rather than solely as the source of instructional behaviors. Criterion-based supervision elevates clear definition of objectives and measurement of outcomes to the place of highest priority in judging the quality of teaching.

In physical education we are in the happy position of having some excellent experimental work on new forms of supervision. Under John Cheffers at Boston University and his colleague Victor Mancini at Ithaca College, interaction analysis has been used as a supervisory mode to produce significant changes in the behavior of teachers (Keilty, 1975; Rochester, note 6; Voegl, note 11; Watty, note 1).

An extensive effort to investigate a behavior analysis model of supervision has been undertaken with the guidance of Daryl Siedentop at Ohio State University (Siedentop, note 7). Applied behavior analysis emerges from a well-defined view of learning and thus provides a system of influence which yields unusual potency when turned to the tasks of supervision. The OSU research program has demonstrated (and often replicated as well) that through applied behavior analysis the supervisor can change the teaching behavior of student interns (Rife, 1973; Hughley, 1973), that the same effects can be produced when university and school supervisors work as a team (Boehm, 1973; Darst, 1973; Hamilton, 1973),

that peer supervision in student teaching can do likewise (Dodds, 1975), that peer supervision requires much different handling if it is to succeed as an early field experience (pre-student teaching) program component (McMillan, note 3), and that the "self as supervisor" is a viable construct (Dessecker, 1975). Perhaps more important for the present purpose was the demonstration that a cooperating teacher can assume the role as supervisory change-agent either through special training (Hutsler, 1976; Cramer, 1977) or as an outcome of participation in a behaviorally-based teacher center established at the school site (McKenzie, 1976).

These pioneering research efforts have as yet to demonstrate the long-term maintenance of behaviors induced through such supervisory procedures. It also is true that research provides only indirect evidence concerning the relation of many teacher behaviors to the ultimate criterion of student learning. These genuine limitations, however, must not obscure the importance of what has been accomplished. The studies at Ohio State have provided the <u>first absolute confirmation</u> that it is possible to induce <u>any</u> specific behaviors in a group of working physical education teachers. These programmatic research efforts in applied pedagogy also stand as models of scientific maturity to be emulated even by the academic "disciplines" in our field.

A continuing problem with all of the new forms of high-impact supervision is their relatively high cost. In terms of human and fiscal resources they demand vastly more input than teacher development has ever received at any level of education. Strategies such as peer supervision

group supervision and self monitoring systems are, in part, attempts to find a way out of this dilemma. Unfortunately, the judgment on cost effectiveness for any system of instructional improvement too often rests on the issue of student achievement. In the short run, supervisory systems are unlikely to produce significant impact on product measures. More abstract indices such as teacher job satisfaction, student activities and subtle changes in the school's social climate are more likely places to seek the consequences of supervision. These often are too distant for an impatient and dollar-conscious public.

Improving supervision is not the real challenge we face for the next decade. It is only part of a larger and more significant problem. Improving what supervisors do with young teachers would be a waste of time and resources unless it was accompanied by a more general change in the system of influences within which supervision operates. The challenge of the 80's is a challenge which can only be accepted at the systemic level.

Substantially improving the physical education delivered to pupils in the public schools by attempting to alter the behaviors of teachers already in the field has no realistic probability. Our primary target must be the new teachers who enter the field, if only because recruitment, initial selection and pre-service training are the sole points over which we exert any measure of control.

The pivotal problem turns out <u>not</u> to be a matter of our current programs having failed to produce graduates with a superior vision of what physical education might be. Even with their limitations, the typical program today turns out teachers who initially are both prepared and inclined to teach in ways which easily are superior to the qualitative

norm in the public schools. Once employed they don't do it -- and there's the rub!

The explanation for this disjunction of events is not in the least obscure. The research literature is voluminous, consistent and convincing. Teachers do not learn to teach in training programs. They learn to teach in the first years of service and the real tutors are students, past models, and the young teacher's solitary, trial and error efforts to cope with the tasks of teaching. The results of that tutelage too often is a traditional kind of teaching which looks much the same from generation to generation (Hoffman, 1971).

If there is to be change for the 80's, or ever, we must begin with a correct formulation of the problem. This appears to be "How can teacher educators take control of the real sources which teach teachers how to teach?" We can guess that the answer will involve two different, but related elements. Pre-professional students must first be immunized against the perception that they have to accept all the values of the school and all of the traditional assumptions about teaching if they are to survive in the gymnasium. Given that protection, young interns must then receive intensive, supervisory assistance while they gradually learn how to function effectively as self-directed teachers.

This paper closes with some suggestions for creating such a program. Please do not, however, expect to get "practical" suggestions. You might as well ask me to suggest what people are doing already, or at least to suggest improvements in a system which does not work now and never will. If practical suggestions mean proposing that we all keep on doing what we

already are doing (with no more than a few painless adjustments) then it is not worth the bother. No band-aid will cover the wound which has so handicapped our programs.

Any program that will work must provide an intensive relationship between faculty and students. This intensity must involve greater investments of time, attention to detail, creative energy, affect and personal commitment. Assuming no expansion of resources available to most programs, this means many fewer students, perhaps one third the number that presently reach the clinical levels of our program. Selective retention is the only professionally responsible way to achieve this goal.

With this small group of students the program must undertake four central tasks:

1. Attenuate the cumulative effects of up to 15 years of student presocialization which has provided powerful models of teaching, many of which are dysfunctional.

2. Provide a thorough conceptual basis for critically examining and reflecting on experience as a teacher.

3. Provide a detailed and realistic description of the social and political realities of schools as they exist, and some understanding of the forces which are brought to bear upon the beginning teacher.

4. Assist the student through the early years of teaching so that they receive certification as professional practitioners at the end of a gradual apprenticeship, supported at every step by a variety of supervisory inputs, all designed to help the trainee master the business of teaching without having to pay the price of accepting life in the gymnasium as it now exists.

To accomplish these tasks the essential elements of the program would have to be reorganized to include the following:

ELEMENT I: more extensive performance training (practice in execution of teaching tasks) that is directly coupled with much greater emphasis

on pedagogical theory. When professional courses are called "too theoretical", students don't mean that they are too full of substantive ideas about how teaching works. They mean the course (and the professor) is too out of touch with the realities of the actual work of teaching. We do not need just more field experiences, nor do we need just more courses in curriculum and instruction. We do need more intensive experiences in which students and professors struggle together to understand their first-hand encounters with teaching in terms of pedagogical theory.

ELEMENT II: More opportunity for students to clarify and examine their own values about teaching, education, play, compulsory schooling, competition, growth, loving, freedom and morality as the central themes of life in the gymnasium. This means formal provision for such encounters and the presence of faculty leaders skilled in humanistic education as it applies to physical education (Griffin, note 2).

ELEMENT III: abandonment of student teaching as it presently exists and substitution of an experience which strengthens the student's ability to understand and resist the regressive forces of the school. In place of student teaching should be a practicum which serves as the field extension of learning experiences directed at developing a rudimentary understanding of the school's social dynamics. In the semester preceding the practicum, students should have studied both educational sociology and the anthropological tools of ethnology. They should demonstrate minimum competence in both domains by undertaking a participant observation study (supported by a concurrent seminar) of "who does what to whom and how" within the context of their practicum setting. Their participation should include all aspects of school life, but should be limited in terms of time,

responsibility and expectations. The primary focus of student teaching would be to "...develop an awareness of the social and cultural dynamics which operate within the educational setting" (Salzillo & Van Fleet, 1977, p. 30). In this way, students will have an opportunity to examine their own assumptions in the light of an experience that is at once real but also not totally cooptative.

ELEMENT IV: extend program responsibility over at least the first year of employment by arranging for students to spend that year as paid interns. Program completion and professional certification must take place after, not prior to entry into the work of full-time teaching. All of the supervisory resources of the program and its associated schools must be brought to bear at this vital point. The internship must be gradual and progressive, assigning new responsibilities only as capacity develops. At each step, collegial help must encourage young teachers to analyze and evaluate their work as they evolve styles of teaching which are grounded in their own understanding of personal and community values.

Changing supervision begins with changing supervisors, and changing teacher education begins with changing teacher educators. Serious attempts to implement program elements such as these would demand a renewal of interest in pedagogy, curriculum and the social foundations of education. Both painful changes in the allocation of resources and the difficult process of faculty re-education would be required. Above all, in many departments a long-term faculty development effort would be needed to bring the kind of instruction used by professors into reasonable congruence with the teaching behaviors they urge upon student majors.

In tne end, the purpose of the program is not to produce graduates who are at war with the schools. The purpose is to help young teachers better understand themselves and the school well enough to master the technology of teaching while still remaining healthy agents for change. The goal of supervision within this kind of program is to nurture young teachers who are free to wiggle out a work space within which to be better kinds of teachers.

Reference Notes

1. Getty, H.H. Effects of instruction and supervision in interaction analysis on the technical behaviors of student teachers. Unpublished masters thesis, Ithaca College, 1977.

2. Griffin, P. Humanistic physical education: What it is, what it isn't and why we only talk about it. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the Massachusetts Association for Health, Physical Education and Recreation, Boxford, MA, 1978. (PETE Program UMass/Amherst)

3. McMillan, S. The implementation and evaluation of a peer feedback model in an early field experience. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University, 1978.

4. Oien, F. Research on student teaching in physical education since 1965: Review and implications. Unpublished paper, PETE Program, University of Massachusetts/Amherst, 1978.

5. Popkewitz, T. Ideology as a problem of teacher education. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

6. Rochester, D.A. The effects of supervision and instruction in the use of interaction analysis on teaching behavior. Unpublished masters thesis, Ithaca College, 1976.

7. Siedentop, D. The Ohio State University Behavior Analysis. Research Program in Physical Education and Sport: 1973-1978. Paper delivered at the Congress of the Canadian Society for Psychomotor Learning and Sports Psychology, Toronto, November, 1978.

8. Tabachnick, B.R. Intern-teacher roles: Illusion, disillusion, and reality. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York, April, 1977.

9. Tabachnick, B.R., Popkewitz, T. & Zeichner, K. Teacher education and the professional perspectives of teachers. A paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Toronto, March, 1978.

10. Templin, T.J. Pupil control and the socialization of the physical education student teacher. Unpublished monograph, Purdue University, 1978.

11. Vogel, R.D. The effects of instruction and supervision in Cheffer's adaption of Flanders Interaction Analysis System on the teaching behaviors of student teachers. Unpublished masters thesis, Ithaca College, 1976.

12. Zeichner, K.M. The student teaching experience: A methodological critique of the research. Unpublished paper, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1978.

References

Becker, H., Greer, B. & Strauss, A. Boys in white: Student culture in Medical School. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Bennie, W. Campus supervision of student teaching: A closer look. Teachers College Journal, 1964, 35, 131-33.

Boehm, J. The effects of a competency-based intervention on student teacher and pupil behavior. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974. No. 75-03013.

Blumberg, A. Supervisors and teachers: A private cold war. Berkeley, Calif.: McCutchan, 1974.

Blumberg, A. & Amidon E. Teacher perceptions of supervisor-teacher interaction. Administrator's Notebook, September, 1965, 14, n.p.

Broudy, H.S. Three modes of teaching and their evaluation. In The evaluation of teaching. Occasional Paper No. 18, Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974, 7-20.

Burlingame, M. Socialization constructs and the teaching of teachers. Quest, XVIII, 1972, 40-56.

Chabassol, D.J. Possession of certain attitudes as predictors of success in practice teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 61, 304-6.

Chasey, W.C. An analysis of existing and preferred student teaching programs of physical education in institutions of higher education in the USA. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 69-17383.

Cogan, M. Clinical supervision. Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1972.

Cornett, J.D. A survey of research relative to supervision of student teachers at the secondary level. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Arkansas) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1966. No. 66-7032.

Cramer, C. The effects of a cooperating teacher training program in applied behavior analysis on teacher behaviors of phsyical education student teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1977. No. 7731847.

Darst, P. The effects of competency-based intervention on student teacher and pupil behaviors. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974. No. 75-03044.

Davies, D. & Amershek, K. Student teaching. In R. Ebel (Ed.), The encyclopedia of educational research. London: Macmillan, 1969, 1376-87.

Dessecker, W. The effects of audiotaped intervention on student teacher behaviors. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975. No. 76-9957.

Dodds, P. A behavioral competency-based peer assessment model for student teacher and pupil behavior. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975. No. 75-26570.

Dyer, C.J. Humanistic supervision. Washington, D. C.: ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, 1977.

Evans, E. Transition to teaching. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1976.

Friebus, R. Agents of socialization involved in student teaching. Journal of Educational Research, 1977, 70, 263-8.

Friedenberg, E. Critique of present practice. In D. McCarty (Ed.), New perspectives on teacher education.. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1973.

Fuller, F.F. Concerns of teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Fuller, F. & Bown, O. On becoming a teacher. In K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education. The seventy-fourth yearbook of NSSE, Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, 25-52.

Gibson, J.G. A study of effective and ineffective behaviors of college supervisors of student teachers in physical education. (Doctoral dissertation, Teachers College, Columbus University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 71-7996.

Goldhammer, R. Clinical supervision. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1969.

Goodlad, J. An analysis of professional laboratory experiences in the education of teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1965, 16, 263-70.

Goodlad, J., et al. Behind the classroom door. Worthington, Ohio: C.A. Jones, 1974.

Hamilton, K. The effects of a competency-based intervention on student teacher and pupil behavior. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974. No. 75-03082.

Harris, B. Supervisor effectiveness? A research resume. Educational Leadership, 1972, 30, 73-79.

Heichberger, R.L. & Young, J.M. Teacher perceptions of supervision and evaluation. Phi Delta Kappan, 1975, 57, 210.

Hermanowicz, H. The pluralistic world of the beginning teacher. In The real world of the beginning teacher. Report of the 19th national TEPS conference, Washington, D.C.: NEA, 1966.

Hoffman, S. Traditional methodology: Prospects for change. Quest, XV, 1971, 51-57.

Horowitz, M. Student-teaching experiences and the attitudes of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 317-24.

Hoy, W. & Rees, R. The bureaucratic socialization of student teachers. Journal of Teacher Education. 1977, 28, 23-26.

Hughley, C. Modification of teaching behaviors in physical education. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973. No. 73-26843.

Hutslar, S. The effects of training cooperating teachers in applied behavior analysis on student teacher behavior in physical education. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1977. No. 77-2420.

Iannaccone, L. Student teaching: A transitional stage in the making of a teacher. Theory into Practice, 1963, 2, 73-81.

Iannaccone, L. & Button, H. Functions of student teaching: Attitude formation and initiation in elementary student teaching. CRP Project Report 1026, Washington, D.C.: USOE, 1964. (ERIC No. ED 003011)

Jacbos, E. Attitude change in teacher education: An inquiry into the role of attitudes in changing teacher behavior. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 410-15.

Johnson, J. Change in student teacher dogmatism. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 62, 224-6.

Karmos, A. & Jacko, C. The role of significant others during the student teaching experience. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 51-55.

Keilty, G.C. The effect of instruction and supervision in Interaction Analysis on the preparation of student teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Boston University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1975. No. 75-20956.

Kraft, R.E. An analysis of supervisor/student teacher interaction. Journal of Physical Education and Recreation. 1974, 45, 37-38.

Labriola, R.J. Comparison of student teacher and initial teaching evaluations for selected teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Pennsylvania State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1965. No. 66-8735.

Lehman, I.J. Evaluating teaching. In W.J. Gephart (Ed.), The evaluation of teaching. Occasional paper No. 18, Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974, 50-86.

Lortie, D.C. Laymen into lawmen: Law schools, careers and professional socialization. Harvard Educational Review, 1959, 29, 352-369.

Lortie, D.C. Teacher socialization: The Robinson Crusoe model. In NCTEPS, The real world of the beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: National Education Association, 1966, 54-66.

Lortie, D.C. Schoolteacher: A sociological study. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Lucas, W.G. A study of the development and field testing of systematic and indirect materials for training supervisors of physical education student teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1974. No. 74-26,546.

Mackey, J., Glenn, A. & Lewis, D. The effectiveness of teacher education. Peabody Journal of Education, 1977, 54, 231-237.

Mason, W.S. The beginning teacher. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., Office of Education Circular No. 644, 1961.

Mawson, M.L. An analysis of the teaching patterns of the student teacher and the attitudes of the student teacher, cooperating teacher, and supervising teacher during student teaching. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Oregon) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973. No. 74-6863.

McDonald, J. & Zaret, E. Student teaching: Benefit or burden? Journal of teacher education, 1971, 22, 51-58.

McGuire, C. Teacher evaluation. In The evaluation of teaching. Occasional Paper No. 18, Bloomington, Ind.: Phi Delta Kappa, 1974, 21-49.

McKenzie, T. Development and evaluation of a model behaviorally-based teacher training center for physical education. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1976. No. 77-2457.

Morris, J. Effects of the university supervisor on the performance and adjustment of student teachers. Journal of Educational Research, 1974, 67, 358-62.

Mosher, R.L. & Purpel, D.E. Supervision: The reluctant profession. Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company, 1972.

Peck, R. & Tucker, J. Research on teacher education. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.), The second handbook of research on teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1973, 940-78.

Perrodin, A. In support of supervising teacher education programs. Journal of Teacher Education, 1961, 12, 36-38.

Popham, W.J. Instructional supervision: A criterion-referenced strategy. (filmstrip, cassette tape & instructor's manual) Los Angeles: Vimcet Associates, 1969.

Pruitt, K.W. & Lee, J.F. Hidden handcuffs in teacher education. Journal of Teacher Education, 1978, 24, 69-72.

Reavis, C.A. Teacher improvement through clinical supervision. Bloomington, Ind.: Ph Delta Kappa, 1978.

Rife, F. Modification of student teacher behavior and its effect upon pupil behavior. (Doctoral dissertation, Ohio State University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1973. No. 74-03298.

Ryan, K. (Ed.), Don't smile until christmas. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975.

Salzillo, F. & Van Fleet, A. Student teaching and teacher education: A sociological model for change. Journal of Teacher Education, 1977, 28, 27-31.

Schueler, H. Gold, M.J. & Mitzel, H.E. The use of television for improving Teacher Training: Phase I improvement of student Teaching. U.S. Dept. of H.E.W., Office of Education. New York: Hunter College, City University of New York, 1962.

Sorenson, G. & Halpert, R. Stress in student teaching. California Journal of Educational Research, 1968, 19, 28-33.

Templin, T. Pupil control ideology and behavior and selected socialization factors influencing the physical education student teacher. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1978. No. 7813747.

Turner, R. An overview of research in teacher education. In R.K. Ryan (Ed.), Teacher Education. The seventy-fourth yearbook of NSSE. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1975, 87-110.

Walberg, H., Metzner, S., Todd, R. & Henry, P. Effects of tutoring and practice teaching on self-concept and attitudes in education students. Journal of Teacher Education. 1968, 19, 283-91.

Walker, J.J. Teachers list irritating supervisory habirs. Phi Delta Kappan, 1976, 57, 350.

Weller, R.H. An observation system for analyzing clinical supervision of teachers. (Doctoral dissertation, Harvard University) Ann Arbor, Mich.: University Microfilms, 1969. No. 69-18245.

Wright, R.G. An analysis of the techniques of guiding student teaching experiences. (Doctoral dissertation, Univeristy of Southern California) Eugene, Oregon: University of Oregon Microform Publications, 1965. No PE 1232.

Yee, A. Interpersonal relationships in the student-teaching triad. Journal of Teacher Education, 1968, 19, 95-112.